

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

10/031,833 06/10/2002 Howard Green H0535/7013 23628 7590 04/04/2006 EXAMINER WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC NAFF, DAVID M FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA ART UNIT PAPE	PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA NAFF, DAVID M	10/031,833	06/10/2002	Howard Green	H0535/7013	H0535/7013 5763	
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA	23628 7590 04/04/2006			EXAMINER		
			NAFF, DAVID M			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				1651		

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/031,833	GREEN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		David M. Naff	1651				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period fo			_,, , , , _ , , _ , , _				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Ma	arch 2006.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13,20,22 and 74-77</u> is/are pending in the application.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13, 20, 22 and 74-77</u> is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex $$	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P10-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
			,				
•							
Attachmen		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Inform	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1651

5

20

25

DETAILED ACTION

An amendment of 3/3/06 amended claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 13 and 20.

Claims examined on the merits are 1-13, 20, 22 and 74-77, which are all claims in the application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-13, 20, 22 and 74-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Support is not found in the specification for defining R as an "organic or inorganic molecule" as recited in claims 1, 9 and 20. The page and line should be pointed out where the specification recites "R is an organic or inorganic molecule".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-13, 20, 22 and 74-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are confusing and unclear as to molecules that are R and not R by reciting in claims 1, 9, and 20 "R is an organic or inorganic molecule". All molecules are either organic or inorganic, which makes the definition of R meaningless since no molecules are excluded as R. The specification does not define R as being any organic or inorganic molecule.

Dependent claims 8 and 76 are confusing by not having clear antecedent basis in the claims on which they depend for dihydroxyacetone being a reactive moiety.

Response to Arguments

In response to dependent claims 8 and 76 reciting "dihydroxyacetone", applicants urge that reactive moieties X_1 and X_2 in claims 1 and 9 are being further limited. However, claims 1 and 9 define X_1 and X_2 as being selected from specific moieties. None of the moieties recited in claims 1 and 9 appear generic to dihydroxyacetone. Without a moiety in claims 1 and 9 being generic to dihydroxyacetone, dependent claims 8 and 76 are not further limiting the moieties in claims 1 and 9, but are requiring a moiety different than selected from the group in claims 1 and 9. Such dependent claims are improper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-11, 20, 74, 75 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Green et al (6,267,957 B1).

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

20

25

The claims are drawn to a composition comprising a compound having a structure of the formula $X_2-L_2-A-L_1-X_1$, wherein A is an agent, L_1 and L_2 are linkers or bonds, X_1 and X_2 are reactive moieties selected from specific moieties containing an R molecule selected from organic and inorganic molecules. X_2 and L_2 can be absent leaving $A-L_1-X_1$ as the compound. Also claimed is a method of attaching an agent to a body tissue using the compound, and a pharmaceutical composition containing the compound and a carrier.

Green et al disclose attaching agents to proteinaceous material such as body tissue. The agent can be provided with a functional group to facilitate attachment (col 9, lines 21-25). Functional groups can be provided by reacting the agent with a bifunctional cross-linker (col 9, lines 34-40). The cross-linker can be disuccinimidyl suberate or bis(sulfosuccinimidyl) suberate (col 9, lines 45-47).

When providing the agent of Green et al with a function group using disuccinimidyl suberate or bis(sulfosuccinimidyl) suberate, a compound, compositions and method as required by the present claims will result. The agent of Green et al can be an enzyme (col 6, line 57) or a nonprotein (col 27, line 28), can be in a pharmaceutical composition (col 13, line 29), and a microparticle does not have to be present. Green et al intend using the agent in a method of attaching the agent to tissue. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to select disuccinimidyl suberate or bis(sulfosuccinimidyl) from the cross-linkers disclosed by Green et al to provide a functional group

Application/Control Number: 10/031,833

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

25

on the agent, and use the functional group-containing agent for attaching to tissue or in a pharmaceutical composition as suggested by Green et al.

Page 5

Response to Arguments

Applicants urge that Green et al is not anticipatory since Green et al does not teach the specific molecules that are the reactive moieties of the compound of the claims. However, when the agent of Green et al is reacted with disuccinimidyl suberate or bis(sulfosuccinimidyl), a free succinimidyl group as contained by Bis-N-hydrocy-succinimide shown by Formula II on page 6 of the present specification will remain as a reactive group for reacting with a protein. This free succinimidyl group will be the reactive moiety D disclosed on page 3 of the present specification, which is a specific reactive moiety of the claims. The present specification discloses (page 22, lines 19 and 20) the cross-linkers, disuccinimidyl suberate as bis(sulfosuccinimidyl), as linkers that can be used. The claims do not exclude the reactive moiety X1 being an un-reacted succinimide of a bi-functional cross-linker that has been reacted with the agent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20 Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al.

The claim requires a kit comprising a package housing, a container containing the composition of claim 1 and instructions for use.

Green et al disclose providing a kit (col 2, line 31).

Art Unit: 1651

5

20

When providing the agent of Green et al with a functional group using disuccinimidyl suberate or bis(sulfosuccinimidyl), it would have been obvious to put the functionalized agent in a kit for later use. Putting instructions on the kit would have been obvious to enable one to use the kit properly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 4, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al in view of Cheng et al (6,080,566).

The claims require the agent to be an enzyme that degrades nerve agents. The enzyme can be OPAA anhydrolase or OPA anhydrase.

Green et al is described above.

Cheng et al disclose degrading nerve agents with OPAA or OPA (col 1, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to use as the enzyme agent of Green et al an OPAA or OPA enzyme to obtain its function to degrade a nerve agent as suggested by Cheng et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 8 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al in view of Fusaro (3,920,808).

The claims require dihydroxyacetone as a functional moiety of the compound.

Green et al is described above.

Fusaro discloses dihydroxyacetone as being reactive with amino derivatices of protein in human skin (col 2, lines 52-65).

Art Unit: 1651

5

15

20

It would have been obvious to use dihydroxyacetone to provide a function group on the agent of Green et al to obtain the function of the dihydroxyacetone to react with protein as disclosed by Fusaro.

Response to Arguments

In response to the rejections of dependent claims 3, 4, 8, 12, 13, 22 and 76, applicants assert that since Green et al does not disclose the compound of claims, these rejections are moot. However, for reasons set forth above, Green et al disclose the claimed compound, or render the claimed compound obvious.

10 Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/031,833

Art Unit: 1651

5

10

15

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

David M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 Page 8

20 DMN 3/31/06